UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/561,239	12/19/2005	Roland Glaser	2923-742	6239
6449 ROTHWELL	7590 06/29/2007 FIGG, ERNST & MAN	EXAM	EXAMINER	
1425 K STREET, N.W.			CHEN, CATHERYNE	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1655	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/29/2007	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•						
Office Action Summary	10/561,239	GLASER, ROLAND				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	Catheryne Chen	ith the correspondence address				
Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	nur the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING C  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 M	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2007.					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	<del></del>					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		·				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>36-60</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>36,37 and 40</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>38-39, 41-60</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Apprity documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No  n received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	·					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>Dec. 19, 2005</u> .		Informal Patent Application				

Art Unit: 1655

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Currently, Claims 36-60 are pending. Claims 36-60 are examined on the merits. Claims 1-35 are canceled.

#### Election/Restrictions

In view of the prior art, the restriction requirement is hereby withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 41-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not teach the identity of the active plant compounds from M. eggersiana.

Undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as claimed due to the quantity of experimentation necessary; limited amount of guidance and limited number of working examples in the specification; nature of the invention; state of the prior art; relative skill level of those in the art; predictability or unpredictability in the art; and the breadth of the claims. In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

These claims either claim or claim the use of "plant active compounds" "obtainable" from M. eggersiana. "Obtainable" only means that the composition could potentially be obtained from this plant. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly

Art Unit: 1655

connected, to determine the identity of the active compounds of M. eggersiana.

After the active ingredients are determined, the artisan would have to test other plants to determine if these active compounds are present. Since it is well known that the presence or absence of chemicals in plant is unpredictable, this would clearly be undue experimentation.

Claims 41-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filled, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a "written description" rejection, rather than an enablement rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant us directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications under the 354 U.S.C. 112, 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

The claims are drawn to medicament comprising plant active compounds "obtainable" from M. eggersiana. "Obtainable" does not limit the medicament to only compounds from M. eggersiana. However, the specification only discloses dried plant material from M. eggersiana. In analyzing whether the written description requirement is met for genus claims, it is first determined whether a representative number of species have been sufficiently described. In this case, only M. eggersiana has been described while the claims potentially encompass thousands of other plant extracts. Applicant has not demonstrated what the

Art Unit: 1655

active compounds of M. eggersiana are and what other plants might potentially have these compounds. This limited information is not deemed sufficient to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that Applicant was in possession of active compounds extracted from all types of plants at the time the application was filed. Thus, it is concluded that the written description requirement is not satisfied for the claimed genus.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 38, 39, 43, 45, 51, 54-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the

Art Unit: 1655

claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claims 38, 43, 54-59 recite the broad recitation "improving the blood flow", and the claim also recites "in particular in peripheral blood vessels" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

In Claims 39, 45, 51, 57, the metes and bounds of "young" are unclear.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is directed to a product of nature.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1655

Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson (Memoris of the New York Botanical Garden, 1981, vol. 32, pages 224-225).

Anderson teaches the plant Mascagnia eggersiana.

### Conclusion

Claims 36, 37, and 40 are allowable. The prior art does not teach that Mascagnia eggersiana has any medical properties. Thus, the prior art does not teach or render obvious claims 36, 37, and 40. Claims 38 and 41-60 are rejected.

### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Catheryne Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-9947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9-5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Catheryne Chen Patent Examiner Art Unit 1655

/Susan Hoffman/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655